

Appl. No. 09/469,913  
Amdt. Dated September 9, 2004  
Reply to Office action of June 10, 2004  
Attorney Docket No. P11785-US1  
EUS/J/P/04-2105

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

#### **1.) Claim Amendments**

Claim 1, 12 and 18 have been amended and claims 2, 13, 19 and 24 - 49 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 3-12, 14-18 and 20-23 remain pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

#### **2.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 6-13, 17-19, 23-24, 28-32, 36-37, 41-42 and 46-49 as being unpatentable over Forslow (US 6,608,832) in view of Youssefzadeh, *et al.* (US 6,198,921); and claims 3-5, 14-16, 20-22, 25-27, 33-35, 38-40 and 43-45 as being unpatentable over Forslow in view of Youssefzadeh, and further in view of Wang *et al.* (US 6,606,311). The Applicants traverse the rejections.

Claim 1, which has been amended to include the limitation of claim 2, recites:

1. A method of providing multiple quality of service classes to subscribers in a network, the method comprising the steps of:  
determining a subscriber's quality of service information by using a database containing quality of service information for each subscriber that has subscribed to one of the multiple quality of service classes;  
storing the subscriber's quality of service information in a visitor location register where the subscriber is currently registered; and  
using the subscriber's quality of service information stored in the visitor location register during a call setup to determine a call transmission quality for the subscriber. (emphasis added)

The Applicants' invention relates to methods for providing multiple quality of service classes to subscribers, and is characterized by a database that stores quality of service information for each subscriber, and storing the information in a visitor location register such that it can be used during a call setup to determine a call transmission quality for the subscriber. Whereas Forslow and Youssefzadeh fail to disclose those limitations, claim 1 is not obvious.

Appl. No. 09/469,913  
Amdt. Dated September 9, 2004  
Reply to Office action of June 10, 2004  
Attorney Docket No. P11785-US1  
EUS/J/P/04-2105

With respect to claim 2, the limitation of which has been added to claim 1, the Examiner asserts that Forslow discloses "using the subscriber's quality of service information stored in the VLR during a call setup to determine a call transmission quality for the subscriber" at column 3, lines 5-7 and column 2, line 66 through column 3, line 5. That portion of Forslow, however, does not disclose using quality of service information during a call setup to determine a call transmission quality, but only discloses that a "VLR . . . requests and receives data about [a] roaming mobile station from the mobile's HLR and stores it." Furthermore, there is no teaching, or suggestion, in Forslow or Youssefzadeh to use quality of service information that is stored in a database for each subscriber that has subscribed to one of multiple quality of service classes, as recited in claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is not obvious over Forslow in view of Youssefzadeh. Likewise, whereas independent claims 12 and 18 include limitations analogous to those of claim 1, those claims are also not obvious over Forslow in view of Youssefzadeh. Furthermore, whereas claims 3-11, 14-17 and 20-23 are dependent from claims 1, 12 and 18, respectively, and include the limitations thereof, those claims are also not obvious in view of those references. The Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 3-12, 14-18 and 20-23 as being obvious over Forslow in view of Youssefzadeh.

Appl. No. 09/469,913  
Amdt. Dated September 9, 2004  
Reply to Office action of June 10, 2004  
Attorney Docket No. P11785-US1  
EUS/JIP/04-2105

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicants believe all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for claims 1, 3-12, 14-18 and 20-23.

The Applicants request a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,



Roger S. Burleigh  
Registration No. 40,542

Date: September 9, 2004

Ericsson Inc.  
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11  
Plano, Texas 75024  
(972) 583-5799  
(972) 583-7864 Fax  
roger.burleigh@ericsson.com